R E M A R K S

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-9, 28-29 and 31-49 were pending. Claims 1-3, 35-38 and 49 have been amended. Claim 50 has been added. Claims 1, 35, 36 and 49 are independent claims. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 35, 36 and 49 have been amended. The amendments to claims 1, 35, 36 and 49 are supported, for example, at one or more portions of original claim 14, page 4, line 10-14, page 17, line 30-page 18, line 2, page 21, lines 12-28 and FIG. 6.

Claim 50 has been added. The added claim is supported, for example, at one or more portions of page 14, lines 8-22.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 6, 28-29, 31-40 and 43-49 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0184191 (Lineberry et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0184191 (Marpe et al.) in view of Web Developer's Virtual Library http://web.archive.org/web/20021208053022/http://wdvl.com/authoring/HTML in view of Webopedia http://web.archive.org/web/20021201224451/http://www.webopedia.com/TERM/M/metadata.html.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended.

Claim 1 now recites a computer-implemented method comprising: providing communications between a plurality of connected source systems, via one or more programmable machines, the connected source systems including information systems, of at least two enterprises; configuring the information systems of the at least two enterprises to operate as a single logical physically distributed information system across the information systems of the

at least two enterprises using processes, modules, application logic, and framework stored in a memory that conform to an architecture supported by a platform including a portal through which data is requested and received by clients; generating, via at least one computing device associated with the portal, an individually configurable user interface remotely connected to said single logical physically distributed information system with templates interacting with metadata to format information according to preset conditions, the metadata describing roles, work sets, and personalization information and interacting with the application logic; populating, via at least one processor, said individually configurable user interface with monitoring information and features regarding a corporate integration on said individually configurable user interface, comprising making a deal selection choice, planning an integration, executing a transaction, executing an integration, and making a post-integration assessment; and providing **an executive cockpit monitoring interface, wherein said executive cockpit monitoring interface comprises a first view associated with the integration, wherein the first view comprises a roster of a team associated with the integration, access to a tool to contact a member of the team, access to a tool to manage the team, an issue list associated with the integration, a tool to control how issues in the issue list are sorted, a chart showing progress of the integration in regard to one or more goals of the integration, access to a meeting scheduler and access to a tracker tool that tracks deliverables associated with the integration**. (emphasis added).

Neither Lineberry et al. nor Marpe et al. nor the cited portion of WDVL nor the cited portion of Webopedia nor any combination thereof proposed in the Office Action teach or suggest the computer-implemented method of claim 1.

Lineberry et al. disclose a method that includes displaying a plurality of pre-defined integration events based upon at least one user selected integration area, each pre-defined integration event being associated with a phase in an acquisition process, displaying at least one user selected, pre-defined integration event for each user selected integration area, displaying at least one of a name of a person responsible, a due date, a completion percentage, and a commentary for each user selected, pre-defined integration event (abstract).

Thus, Lineberry et al. disclose a display with at least one user selected integration event for each user selected integration area, and at least one of a name of a person responsible, a due date, a completion percentage, and a commentary for each user selected integration event.

However, at the very least, Lineberry et al. do not teach or suggest that such display also includes **access to a tool to contact the responsible person**.

Moreover, and at the very least, nor does Lineberry et al. teach or suggest that such display also includes **access to a meeting scheduler**.

Consequently, even if the display in Lineberry et al. constitutes a type of view, and even if the at least one of a name of a person constitutes a type of a roster of a team associated with an integration, Lineberry et al. do not teach or suggest **a view that comprises** the combination of **a roster of a team associated with the integration, access to a tool to contact a member of the team, and access to a meeting scheduler**, as recited in claim 1. (emphasis added).

Lineberry et al. also disclose a business leader integration area user interface in FIG. 8 and an integration progress report user interface in FIG. 19.

However, even if the business leader integration area user interface in FIG. 8 constitutes a type of **executive cockpit monitoring interface**, Lineberry et al. do not teach or suggest that such interface comprises a view that comprises the combination of **a roster of a team associated with the integration, access to a tool to contact a member of the team, access to a tool to manage the team, an issue list associated with the integration, a tool to control how issues in the issue list are sorted, a chart showing progress of the integration in regard to one or more goals of the integration, access to a meeting scheduler and access to a tracker tool that tracks deliverables associated with the integration**, as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

Similarly, even if the integration progress report user interface in FIG. 19 constitutes a type of **executive cockpit monitoring interface**, Lineberry et al. do not teach or suggest that such interface comprises a view that comprises the combination of **a roster of a team associated with the integration, access to a tool to contact a member of the team, access to a tool to manage the team, an issue list associated with the integration, a tool to control how issues in the issue list are sorted, a chart showing progress of the integration in regard to one or more goals of the integration, access to a meeting scheduler and access to a tracker tool**

that tracks deliverables associated with the integration, as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

Nor does it appear that it would be obvious to modify Lineberry et al. to provide such.

Moreover, nor does Marpe et al., the cited portions of WDVL or Webopedia, or any combination thereof proposed in the Office Action teach or suggest **an executive cockpit monitoring interface, wherein said executive cockpit monitoring interface comprises a first view associated with the integration, wherein the first view comprises a roster of a team associated with the integration, access to a tool to contact a member of the team, access to a tool to manage the team, an issue list associated with the integration, a tool to control how issues in the issue list are sorted, a chart showing progress of the integration in regard to one or more goals of the integration, access to a meeting scheduler and access to a tracker tool that tracks deliverables associated with the integration**, as recited in claim 1. (emphasis added).

For at least the reasons above, neither Lineberry et al. nor Marpe et al. nor the cited portion of WDVL nor the cited portion of Webopedia nor any combination thereof proposed in the Office Action teach or suggest a computer-implemented method comprising: providing communications between a plurality of connected source systems, via one or more programmable machines, the connected source systems including information systems, of at least two enterprises; configuring the information systems of the at least two enterprises to operate as a single logical physically distributed information system across the information systems of the at least two enterprises using processes, modules, application logic, and framework stored in a memory that conform to an architecture supported by a platform including a portal through which data is requested and received by clients; generating, via at least one computing device associated with the portal, an individually configurable user interface remotely connected to said single logical physically distributed information system with templates interacting with metadata to format information according to preset conditions, the metadata describing roles, work sets, and personalization information and interacting with the application logic; populating, via at least one processor, said individually configurable user interface with monitoring information and features regarding a corporate integration on said individually configurable user interface, comprising making a deal selection choice, planning an integration, executing a transaction,

executing an integration, and making a post-integration assessment; and providing **an executive cockpit monitoring interface, wherein said executive cockpit monitoring interface comprises a first view associated with the integration, wherein the first view comprises a roster of a team associated with the integration, access to a tool to contact a member of the team, access to a tool to manage the team, an issue list associated with the integration, a tool to control how issues in the issue list are sorted, a chart showing progress of the integration in regard to one or more goals of the integration, access to a meeting scheduler and access to a tracker tool that tracks deliverables associated with the integration**, as recited in claim 1. (emphasis added).

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 35, 36 and 49

Claims 35, 36 and 49 also recite **an executive cockpit monitoring interface, wherein said executive cockpit monitoring interface comprises a first view associated with the integration, wherein the first view comprises a roster of a team associated with the integration, access to a tool to contact a member of the team, access to a tool to manage the team, an issue list associated with the integration, a tool to control how issues in the issue list are sorted, a chart showing progress of the integration in regard to one or more goals of the integration, access to a meeting scheduler and access to a tracker tool that tracks deliverables associated with the integration**. (emphasis added).

Consequently, neither Lineberry et al. nor Marpe et al. nor the cited portion of WDVL nor the cited portion of Webopedia nor any combination thereof proposed in the Office Action teach or suggest the subject matter of claims 35, 36 and 49.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 35, 36 and 49 are also respectfully requested.

Dependent claims

Claims 2-4, 8-9, 28-29, 13-34 and 50 depend from independent claim 1 and therefore should be allowed for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1.

Claims 37-48 depend from independent claim 36 and therefore should be allowed for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 36.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Because the reasons set forth above are sufficient to overcome the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action, Applicants do not address some of the assertions set forth therein and/or other possible reasons for overcoming the rejections. Nonetheless, Applicants reserve the right to address such assertions and/or to present other possible reasons for overcoming the rejections in any future paper and/or proceeding.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application in any way, the Examiner is cordially requested to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-0006, ext. 1014.

Respectfully submitted,

 December 29, 2010   /Mark Steinberg/

     Date   Mark Steinberg
                            Registration No. 40,829
                            Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
                            50 Locust Avenue
                            New Canaan, CT 06840
                            (203) 972-0006, ext. 1014